

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11 -14 and 23 are pending.

The amendments to claims 1 and 8 are supported at page 9, lines 11-12. No new matter has been entered.

New claim 21 is supported by Claim 1 and the present specification at page 10, lines 17-19.

New claim 22 is supported by Claim 1.

New claim 23 is supported by Claim 6.

New claim 24 is supported by page 5, last paragraph to page 6, line 11.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over CA 910844. The Office Action asserts the reference teaches or suggests each feature of the claims. In addition to the arguments and remarks presented in the Request for Reconsideration After Final Rejection of August 3, 2006 (incorporated herein), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

The Advisory Action of August 16, 2006 states that because there is no indication in the reference that the figures are to scale, “[A]pplicants have no way of knowing what the angle is without more specifics.” The Advisory Action apparently asserts, because the reference drawings are not indicated as being to scale, and because the reference specification does not clarify the particular angle, or range of angles, shown by its Figure 3, it is not possible to know what the angle is “without more specifics.” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted it is improper to assert the reference teaches or suggests an angle “between 75 and 105° without more specifics.

Applicants respectfully submit the invention of CA ‘484 is substantially similar to the embodiment shown as Figure 3 in the present specification (identified as PRIOR ART), and described at page 4, lines 12-23. Because the angle is not within the presently claimed range, the resulting fracture line “is essentially on one side of the cathode mother plate 10.” As shown in Figure 3, the resulting sheets are not “substantially symmetrical sheets,” as recited by the present claims.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit the selection of the range of between 75 and 105°, permits (1) separation of the deposited metal into two substantially equivalent sheets, by (2) having a fracture line inside the V-groove, (3) without the need for repeated rotating and flapping, as described in the present specification at page 5, lines 9-14 and page 6, lines 5-12, none of which features are taught or suggested by the reference. It is the selection of the presently recited range that overcomes the deficiencies of the prior art. As described at page 9, lines 11-14, certain groove expressing the formula $90^\circ \pm 15^\circ$ sizes permit such symmetrical splitting of the deposited metal while others do not. Neither CA '484 nor any other cited reference suggests limiting the angle of the V-groove as presently claimed. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit the claims are patentable over CA '484.

Claims 2 and 9 recite the line of weakness is formed within the arc of the V. There is no teaching or suggestion of such a feature in the reference. Since, as shown by Figure 3, the angle of the V determines the location of the line of weakness, it cannot be said that such a feature is inherent, i.e., necessarily present, in the cited reference. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit claims 2 and 9 are allowable over CA '484.

Claims 5 and 12 recite "wherein the groove is shaped to allow deposition of metal directly adjacent the apex of the groove." While the reference teaches that the deposition occurs "in directions normal to the sides of the V-groove" (page 7, lines 14-15), it is not necessarily so, i.e., inherent, that the deposition occurs "directly adjacent to the apex of the groove." As shown by Figure 3 of the present specification, depending upon the angle of the V-groove, such a feature may be impossible. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit claims 5 and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 7 and 14 recite "wherein the groove is shaped to capture gas rising from below the cathode plate during deposition of metal." Again, there is no teaching or suggestion of such a feature in the reference. Since, as shown by Figures 3-6, the angle of the V determines the location of the line of weakness, it cannot be said that such a feature is inherent, i.e., necessarily present, in the cited reference. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit claims 7 and 14 are allowable over CA '484.

New claim 21 further distinguishes the present invention from the invention of CA '484. Specifically, claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, a step of trapping gas in the deposited metal to define

the location of the frangible portion. By directing the location of the trapped gas, the location of the frangible portion, i.e., the location the deposited metal will fracture, can be more accurately controlled, thus permitting more reliability in the symmetrical nature of the resulting sheets. As the reference neither teaches nor suggests such a step, Applicants respectfully present new claim 21 is allowable over the cited references.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted the present claims are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and the present invention is novel and inventive over the cited document. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If any fee is necessary to make this paper, or any paper filed herewith, timely and/or complete, such fee may be deducted from deposit account number 19-4375.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 28, 2006

By: /anthony p ventutino/
Anthony P. Venturino
Registration No. 31,674

APV/EPR
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APV31535

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L STREET, N.W., SUITE 850
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
TEL. 202-785-0100 / FAX. 202-785-0200